

Remarks

A. Pending Claims

Claims 1, 5-11, and 15-25 are rejected. Claims 1, 5, 7-11, and 15-25 are pending.

B. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai et al. Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482 to Ochiai et al. (hereinafter “Ochiai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,228 to Sposato. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection for at least the same reasons recited in Applicant’s previous response. Applicant has, however, amended the claims for clarification.

Claim 1 describes a combination of feature including, but not limited to, the features of:

wherein the second program is obtained from the network server and loaded into RAM memory of the multimedia information playback apparatus

Applicant further submits that the combination of Ochiai and Sposato does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature of Applicant’s claimed method.

With respect to Applicant’s previous response, the Office Action states that:

Ochi discloses a first navigator unit (CPU 5) that runs a first program (first script) that reads out the control information (the script data/code/instructions within the script that defines the original broadcasting order) in order to playback the multimedia information in the original broadcasting order as previously discussed in the rejection above. The first program is an internally loaded program. Furthermore, Ochiai discloses that the CPU executes a second program (another script) that reads out the control information (the script data/code/instructions with the script that defines a different playback order) in order to playback the multimedia information in another order as previously discussed in the rejection above. The second program/script is externally obtained from a server. Sposato discloses that the functions of the CPU are divided to another microprocessor. Therefore, Ochiai in view of Sposato discloses two distinct navigator units (e.g., the CPU and microprocessor).

Applicant notes that a script program is a program written in a script language, and so a CPU cannot directly interpret and execute a script. A CPU first generates a script interpretation/execution module by executing a script interpretation/execution program, that script interpretation/execution module interprets the script, and enables the functions described in that script. For example, a program (script) written in Java Script is interpreted and executed by a Web browser (script interpretation/execution module) and a program (script) written in Perl is interpreted and executed by a Perl module (script interpretation/execution module)

In Applicant's claims, the second program is not a program (script) written in JavaScript or Perl, but a program (script interpretation/execution program) corresponding to a Web browser or Perl module program. The second program, which is a script interpretation/execution program, is not provided in advance in a multimedia information playback apparatus, but is acquired from a network server and loaded in RAM included in the multimedia information playback apparatus. Therefore, the second program does not remain in the multimedia information playback information after turning off the multimedia information playback apparatus. Accordingly, it is difficult for an unauthorized user to access and analyze the second program (second navigator), so the risk of the second program (second navigator) being altered and its playback processing being shifted for malicious execution can be greatly reduced.

For at least the reasons state above, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over Ochiai.

C. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Kamo Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002-0057694 to Kamo (hereinafter "Kamo"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 5 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Kamo.

D. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Dan Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,637 to Dan et al. (hereinafter “Dan”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Dan.

E. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Brown Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,179 to Brown et al. (“Brown”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 8 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Brown.

F. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Mages Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,329 to Mages et al. (hereinafter “Mages”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 10 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Mages.

H. Additional Remarks

Based on the above, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time to respond to the Office Action dated January 17, 2007. A fee authorization form in the amount of \$60.00 is enclosed for the extension of time fee. If any further extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5664-00100/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark R. DeLuca/

Mark R. DeLuca
Reg. No. 44,649
Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: May 16, 2008